

ON THE LOGICAL STRENGTH OF NASH-WILLIAMS' THEOREM ON TRANSFINITE SEQUENCES

ALBERTO MARCONE

ABSTRACT. We show that Nash-Williams' theorem asserting that the countable transfinite sequences of elements of a better-quasi-ordering ordered by embeddability form a better-quasi-ordering is provable in the subsystem of second order arithmetic $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ but is not equivalent to $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$. We obtain some partial results towards the proof of this theorem in the weaker subsystem $\mathbf{ATR}_0$ and we show that the minimality lemmas typical of wqo and bqo theory imply $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ and hence cannot be used in such a proof.

The most natural generalization of the notion of well-ordering to partial orderings is the concept of well-quasi-ordering or wqo. A binary relation $\preceq$ on a set Q is a quasi-ordering if it is reflexive and transitive (it is a partial ordering if it is also anti-symmetric) and a quasi-ordering is wqo if it contains no infinite descending sequences and no infinite anti-chains (sets of mutually incomparable elements). Ramsey's theorem implies that a quasi-ordering $(Q, \preceq)$ is wqo if and only if for any function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow Q$ there exist n and m such that $n < m$ and $f(n) \preceq f(m)$. For a history of the notion of wqo see [11].

Unfortunately the notion of wqo does not enjoy nice closure properties: when we apply an operation in some sense infinitary to a wqo we cannot expect the resulting quasi-ordering to be wqo. This shortcoming prompted Nash-Williams, in a sequence of papers culminating in [20], to introduce the notion of better-quasi-ordering or bqo, i.e. wqo of a particularly well-behaved kind. Since then a vast theory of bqos has been developed and has provided the tools for proving that many natural quasi-orderings are bqo, and *a fortiori* wqo. One of the most important results in this area is Laver's theorem ([12]) establishing Fraïssé's conjecture that the class of countable linear orders is wqo under embeddability. For surveys on bqo (and wqo) theory see [17] and [22].

We study bqos from the point of view of *reverse mathematics* (see [27] for an overview of this research program; Simpson's forthcoming monograph [30] is the most complete reference in this area) by trying to establish which subsystems of second order arithmetic are necessary to prove the theorems of bqo theory. Some results of this kind have already been obtained for wqo theory: see [26], [7], [28] and [3]. We concentrate on the very first result about bqos proved by Nash-Williams ([20]) which we denote by **NWT** and which asserts that if a quasi-ordering Q is bqo then $\tilde{Q}$ (the set of all countable sequences of elements of Q ordered by

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 03F35. Secondary: 06A07.

Key words and phrases. Better-quasi-ordering, reverse mathematics, minimal bad array.

This paper has been completed during the summer of 1994, when the author was visiting University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign with funding by MURST of Italy and by a bilateral CNR-NSF grant.

embeddability) is also bqo. Actually the very concept of bqo was introduced by Nash-Williams in his search for a notion closed under the operation $Q \mapsto \tilde{Q}$.

Nash-Williams' original proof of **NWT** and all its refinements rely on a result that in contemporary literature is called the *minimal bad array lemma*, a powerful technique that is widely used to prove that a quasi-ordering is a bqo: for treatments in which this technique is explicitly isolated see [13], [17] (where is called the *fore-running technique*) and [25], [4] (which use a different but equivalent definition of bqo). The proof of the minimal bad array lemma appears to require rather strong set-existence axioms (e.g. the comprehension scheme characterizing the subsystem of second order arithmetic $\Pi_2^1\text{-CA}_0$) and this fact hinted that the results of bqo theory could be proof-theoretically very strong. In this paper we use only a weak version of the minimal bad array lemma which we call the *locally minimal bad array lemma* and which is a direct generalization of the minimal bad sequence lemma of wqo theory: this is actually the first version of the minimal bad array lemma proved for a specific quasi-ordering by Nash-Williams in [19]. Using the locally minimal bad array lemma we prove **NWT** in the system $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$, thus showing that this theorem of bqo theory is not stronger than many other mathematical results which are known to be equivalent to $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ ([27], [30]). This result can be considered as a first step towards the understanding of which set-existence axioms are needed to prove other results of bqo theory, such as Fraïssé's conjecture, that have been object of much interest in recent times ([3], [24]). In [3] Clote claimed to have proved **NWT** in ATR_0 , but unfortunately that proof is incorrect, as Clote himself has acknowledged (personal communication).

As in [15] (see also [16]) we use the locally minimal bad array lemma to prove the generalization of the classical Higman's theorem ([9]) which states that Q bqo implies $Q^{<\omega}$ bqo and is denoted by **GHT**. This is the only step of our proof of **NWT** where we use some form of the minimal bad array lemma. The other main ingredient of our proof is hereditarily indecomposable sequences which are analogous to the hereditarily additively indecomposable countable linear orderings introduced by Laver in [12] and used by Rosenstein ([23]) in his exposition of the proof of Fraïssé's conjecture.

In addition to proving **NWT** in $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ we show that **NWT** is not equivalent to $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ and we obtain some partial results toward the proof of **NWT** in the weaker system ATR_0 . A proof of **NWT** in ATR_0 would establish the logical strength of this theorem because it follows from the results obtained by Shore in [24] that **NWT** implies ATR_0 over the weak base system RCA_0 . The only step of the proof of **NWT** we cannot carry out in ATR_0 is **GHT**. We have therefore reduced the problem of proving **NWT** in ATR_0 to the problem of proving **GHT** in ATR_0 : since **GHT** is the particular case of **NWT** in which we deal only with finite sequences we believe that this is a significant step forward.

We also prove that the locally minimal bad array lemma is equivalent (over RCA_0) to $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ and hence not provable in ATR_0 : therefore a proof of **GHT** in ATR_0 (if such a proof exists) must avoid the use of the locally minimal bad array lemma.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In section 1 we briefly present the subsystems of second order arithmetic we will be dealing with and quote the results we will be using in the following sections: this part is not self-contained and assumes some acquaintance with the basic ideas of reverse mathematics. In section 2 we

formally define the notion of bqo within the appropriate subsystems of second order arithmetic and prove in $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ the locally minimal bad array lemma: this section is intended to be self-contained and we do not assume any previous knowledge of bqo theory. In section 3 we state precisely **NWT** and **GHT**. In section 4 we obtain the main result of the paper by showing that **NWT** is provable in $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$, while in section 5 we show that **NWT** does not imply $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ by studying the possibility of proving **NWT** in ATR_0 . In section 6 we prove that the locally minimal bad array lemma (even in its simplest form, i.e. the minimal bad sequence lemma) implies $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$.

Most of the results of this paper were originally obtained in the author's Ph.d. thesis ([15]) as a consequence of a fine analysis of the notion of bqo. I am very much indebted to my advisor Stephen G. Simpson, who introduced me to bqo theory and to the techniques of reverse mathematics, supported me throughout this research and suggested several improvements to the paper: the results of section 6 were indeed obtained jointly with him.

1. SUBSYSTEMS OF SECOND ORDER ARITHMETIC

The subsystems of second order arithmetic we will be using are the following.

Definition 1.1. The system RCA_0 consists of the induction scheme restricted to Σ_1^0 formulas and the comprehension scheme restricted to Δ_1^0 formulas.

The systems ACA_0 , $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ and $\Pi_2^1\text{-CA}_0$ (in order of increasing strength) are obtained by restricting the comprehension scheme to arithmetical, Π_1^1 and Π_2^1 formulas respectively.

The system ATR_0 (which is intermediate between ACA_0 and $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$) is obtained by adding to ACA_0 a scheme asserting that we can iterate arithmetical comprehension along any well-ordering.

The system $\Sigma_1^1\text{-AC}_0$ is obtained by adding to ACA_0 the following Σ_1^1 choice scheme:

$$\forall n \exists X \varphi(n, X) \longrightarrow \exists Y \forall n \varphi(n, (Y)_n)$$

where φ is a Σ_1^1 formula and $(Y)_n = \{m \mid (m, n) \in Y\}$ (here (m, n) is a fixed pairing function).

All these subsystems of second order arithmetic have been widely studied in the program of *reverse mathematics* begun by Harvey Friedman and Stephen Simpson: more information about them can be found in [27] and, with greater detail, in Simpson's forthcoming monograph ([30]). Here we limit ourselves to the statement of a few theorems that will be used in the next sections. Whenever we begin a definition, lemma or theorem by the name of one of these subsystems between parenthesis we mean that the definition is given, or the statement provable, within that subsystem.

Theorem 1.2. ATR_0 proves the Δ_1^1 comprehension scheme.

Proof. See [30], section V.5. □

Theorem 1.3. ATR_0 proves the Σ_1^1 choice scheme and therefore ATR_0 is stronger than $\Sigma_1^1\text{-AC}_0$.

Proof. See [30], section V.8. □

We will need to discuss countable ordinals, which can be coded in the language of second order arithmetic by means of well-orderings: details of this coding can be found in [5], [10] and [30]. In particular well-orderings are compared by embeddability. As usual, we will use letters from the beginning of the Greek alphabet to denote ordinals. In [10] are given precise definitions of all basic ordinal operations, including exponentiation, and the following theorem is proved.

Theorem 1.4. ($\mathbf{ATR}_0$) *Cantor's normal form theorem, i.e. the statement "for any ordinal α there exists a finite sequence $\alpha_1 \geq \dots \geq \alpha_n$ of ordinals such that $\alpha = \omega^{\alpha_1} + \dots + \omega^{\alpha_n}$ ".*

Proof. See [10], where it is shown that, over $\mathbf{RCA}_0$, $\mathbf{ATR}_0$ is equivalent to Cantor's normal form theorem. $\square$

Definition 1.5. ($\mathbf{RCA}_0$) Ordinals of the form ω^α are called indecomposable.

Definition 1.6. An ω -model $\mathfrak{M}$ is a model for the language of second order arithmetic whose first order part (i.e. the part regarding the natural numbers) is the standard model $(\mathbb{N}, +, \cdot, \neq, \neq, <)$. Therefore $\mathfrak{M}$ can be identified with the subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ on which the set variables are allowed to range and we write $X \in \mathfrak{M}$ to mean that X belongs to this subset.

We write $\mathfrak{M} \models \varphi$ to mean that the formula φ holds within $\mathfrak{M}$ and we say that $\mathfrak{M}$ is a model of the subsystem $\mathbf{T}$ of second order arithmetic if all the axioms of $\mathbf{T}$ hold in $\mathfrak{M}$.

Definition 1.7. A β -model $\mathfrak{M}$ is an ω -model such that for any Σ_1^1 sentence φ with parameters from $\mathfrak{M}$, $\mathfrak{M} \models \varphi$ if and only if φ is true.

Countable ω - and β -models can be coded in $\mathbf{RCA}_0$ and several results concerning them can be proved in appropriate subsystems of second order arithmetic (see [30], chapters VII and VIII). The ones we will use in section 5 are the following.

Theorem 1.8. ($\mathbf{ATR}_0$) *For any $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ there exists a countable ω -model $\mathfrak{M}$ of $\Sigma_1^1\text{-}\mathbf{AC}_0$ such that $X \in \mathfrak{M}$.*

Proof. See [30], section VIII.4, or [29]. $\square$

Theorem 1.9. ($\Pi_1^1\text{-}\mathbf{CA}_0$) *For any $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ there exists a countable β -model $\mathfrak{M}$ such that $X \in \mathfrak{M}$.*

Proof. See [30], section VII.2. $\square$

The following fact is well-known but seldom explicitly stated: a slightly weaker version of it is proved in [1].

Corollary 1.10. *No Π_2^1 statement consistent with $\mathbf{ATR}_0$ implies $\Pi_1^1\text{-}\mathbf{CA}_0$ over $\mathbf{ATR}_0$.*

Proof. Suppose $\mathbf{ATR}_0$ proves that $\forall X \psi(X)$ implies $\Pi_1^1\text{-}\mathbf{CA}_0$, where ψ is Σ_1^1 and suppose also that the theory $\mathbf{T}$ consisting of $\mathbf{ATR}_0$ plus $\forall X \psi(X)$ is consistent.

We reason in $\mathbf{T}$. $\mathbf{T}$ includes $\Pi_1^1\text{-}\mathbf{CA}_0$ and by theorem 1.9 there exists a β -model $\mathfrak{M}$. For every $X \in \mathfrak{M}$ we have $\mathfrak{M} \models \psi(X)$: hence $\mathfrak{M} \models \forall X \psi(X)$. Moreover every β -model is a model of $\mathbf{ATR}_0$ ([30], section VII.2) and hence $\mathfrak{M}$ is a model of $\mathbf{T}$.

Thus we have shown in $\mathbf{T}$ that there exists a model of $\mathbf{T}$: this contradicts Gödel's Second Incompleteness Theorem. $\square$

2. BQO THEORY

An alternative definition of bqo, equivalent to Nash-Williams' original one, has been introduced by Simpson in [25]: this definition uses Borel maps and allows the use of many powerful tools from descriptive set theory in bqo theory. Simpson's definition has proved to be very useful but does not lend itself to the analysis we pursue in this paper; therefore we will use Nash-Williams' definition, which has a strong combinatorial flavor.

Definition 2.1. ($\mathbf{RCA}_0$) If s is a finite sequence of natural numbers we denote by $\text{lh}(s)$ its length and, for every $i < \text{lh}(s)$, by $s(i)$ its $(i+1)$ -th element. Then we write this sequence as $\langle s(0), \dots, s(\text{lh}(s) - 1) \rangle$ or as $\langle s(i) : i < \text{lh}(s) \rangle$. In particular $\langle \rangle$ denotes the unique sequence of length 0.

If s and t are finite sequences we write $s \sqsubseteq t$ if s is an initial segment of t , i.e. if $\text{lh}(s) \leq \text{lh}(t)$ and $\forall i < \text{lh}(s) \ s(i) = t(i)$. We write $s \subseteq t$ if the range of s is a subset of the range of t , i.e. if $\forall i < \text{lh}(s) \ \exists j < \text{lh}(t) \ s(i) = t(j)$. $s \sqsubset t$ and $s \subset t$ have the obvious meanings and we extend these notations also to the case where t is an infinite sequence (i.e. a function from $\mathbb{N}$ to $\mathbb{N}$).

We write $s \hat{\ } t$ for the concatenation of s and t , i.e. the unique sequence u such that $\text{lh}(u) = \text{lh}(s) + \text{lh}(t)$, for every $i < \text{lh}(s)$ $u(i) = s(i)$ and for every $i < \text{lh}(t)$ $u(\text{lh}(s) + i) = t(i)$.

If s is a finite sequence and $i \leq \text{lh}(s)$ we denote by $s[i]$ the initial segment of s of length i , i.e. the unique sequence t such that $t \sqsubseteq s$ and $\text{lh}(t) = i$. If $\text{lh}(s) > 0$ we denote by s^- the sequence obtained from s by deleting its first element, i.e. $s^- = \langle s(1), \dots, s(\text{lh}(s) - 1) \rangle$. These notations are extended to infinite sequences as well.

If $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ we denote as usual by $[X]^{<\omega}$ (resp. $[X]^\omega$) the set of all finite (resp. infinite) subsets of X . Throughout this paper we will identify a subset of $\mathbb{N}$ with the unique sequence enumerating it in increasing order. Therefore if $s \in [\mathbb{N}]^{<\omega}$ we have that $\text{lh}(s)$ is the cardinality of s and, for $i < \text{lh}(s)$, $s(i)$ is the $(i+1)$ -th least element of s . Similarly if $X \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$ then $X(i)$ is the $(i+1)$ -th least element of X .

Remark 2.2. Obviously $[X]^\omega$ does not formally exist within $\mathbf{RCA}_0$ or even full second order arithmetic: the use of this notation is just a convenient shorthand. We will refer to objects like $[X]^\omega$ as classes: a class $\mathcal{C}$ is the collection of all Y satisfying some formula $\varphi(Y)$. $Y \in \mathcal{C}$ then stands for $\varphi(Y)$.

Definition 2.3. ($\mathbf{ACA}_0$) If B is a subset of $[\mathbb{N}]^{<\omega}$ we denote by $\text{base}(B)$ the set

$$\{ n \mid \exists s \in B \ \exists i < \text{lh}(s) \ s(i) = n \}$$

Remark 2.4. Since $\mathbf{RCA}_0$ lacks arithmetical comprehension the set $\text{base}(B)$ does not formally exist within $\mathbf{RCA}_0$, but we can use this notation again as a convenient shorthand.

The following definitions are basic for bqo theory and were first given by Nash-Williams in [19] and [20], where the notion of better-quasi-ordering was introduced.

Definition 2.5. ($\mathbf{RCA}_0$) A set $B \subseteq [\mathbb{N}]^{<\omega}$ is a block if it satisfies the following conditions:

1. $\text{base}(B)$ is infinite;

- 2. $\forall X \in [\text{base}(B)]^\omega \exists s \in B \ s \sqsubset X$;
- 3. $\forall s, t \in B \ s \not\sqsubset t$.

B is a barrier if it satisfies (1), (2) and

- (3') $\forall s, t \in B \ s \not\sqsubset t$.

Remark 2.6. Since $s \sqsubset t$ implies $s \subset t$ it is immediate that in $\mathbf{RCA}_0$ every barrier is a block. Notice that if B is a block and $Y \in [\text{base}(B)]^\omega$ there exists a unique block $B' \subseteq B$ such that $\text{base}(B') = Y$, namely $B' = \{s \in B \mid s \subset Y\}$. Notice also that if B is a barrier then B' is also a barrier: we say that B' is a subbarrier of B .

Definition 2.7. ($\mathbf{RCA}_0$) Let $s, s' \in [\mathbb{N}]^{<\omega}$: we write $s \triangleleft s'$ if there exists $t \in [\mathbb{N}]^{<\omega}$ such that $s \sqsubseteq t$ and $s' \sqsubseteq t^-$.

Remark 2.8. $\triangleleft$ is neither reflexive nor transitive: we have $\langle 3, 5, 6 \rangle \triangleleft \langle 5, 6, 8, 9 \rangle \triangleleft \langle 6, 8 \rangle$ but $\langle 3, 5, 6 \rangle \not\triangleleft \langle 6, 8 \rangle$. In $\mathbf{RCA}_0$ it is easy to prove that if s and t are members of a barrier and $s \triangleleft t$ holds then $\text{lh}(s) \leq \text{lh}(t)$.

We can now define the main notions of bqo theory.

Definition 2.9. ($\mathbf{RCA}_0$) Let Q be a set (i.e. a subset of $\mathbb{N}$) and let $\preceq$ be a quasi-ordering on this set (i.e. a subset of $Q \times Q$ which encodes a binary relation which is reflexive and transitive). If B is a barrier and $f : B \rightarrow Q$ we say that f is a Q -array. A Q -array f is good (with respect to $\preceq$ when there is danger of confusion) if there exist $s, t \in B$ such that $s \triangleleft t$ and $f(s) \preceq f(t)$. If f is not good we say that it is bad. If for every $s, t \in B$ such that $s \triangleleft t$ we have $f(s) \preceq f(t)$ we say that f is perfect.

Definition 2.10. ($\mathbf{RCA}_0$) Let $(Q, \preceq)$ be a quasi-ordering as above: we say that $\preceq$ is a countable bqo if every Q -array is good with respect to $\preceq$.

Remark 2.11. To see that a bqo is a wqo consider the barrier B of all singletons of $\mathbb{N}$. Then B is in one-to-one correspondence with $\mathbb{N}$ and hence a Q -array with domain B can be viewed as a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow Q$. Since $\langle n \rangle \triangleleft \langle m \rangle$ if and only if $n < m$, f is good if and only if there exist n and m such that $n < m$ and $f(n) \preceq f(m)$.

Remark 2.12. We have given the definition of bqo only for countable quasi-orderings (but in section 3 we will also explain what we mean by saying that a class is bqo): this is due to the limitations of the language of second-order arithmetic, but in the case of bqos the restriction to the countable case does not affect the development of the theory. In fact, since the range of a Q -array is always countable, it is immediate that a quasi-ordering Q is bqo if and only if every countable subset of Q is bqo.

We now show that some properties of blocks, barriers and Q -arrays which were proved by Nash-Williams in [18] and [19] are actually provable within $\mathbf{ATR}_0$.

Theorem 2.13. ($\mathbf{ATR}_0$) If B is a block (resp. barrier) and $B = B_1 \cup B_2$ then there exists a block (resp. barrier) B' such that either $B' \subseteq B_1$ or $B' \subseteq B_2$.

Proof. The case in which B is a block is essentially the clopen Ramsey theorem that can be rephrased for formalization within $\mathbf{ATR}_0$ as “if $B_1, B_2 \subseteq [X]^{<\omega}$ are such that for all $Y \in [X]^\omega$ there exists $s \in B_1 \cup B_2$ such that $s \sqsubset Y$ then there exist $H \in [X]^\omega$ and $i \in \{1, 2\}$ such that for all $Y \in [H]^\omega$ there exists $s \in B_i$ such that $s \sqsubset Y$ ”. For proving our theorem then it suffices to let $B' \subseteq B$ be the unique block with $\text{base}(B') = H$. In [6] and [30] it is shown that, over $\mathbf{ACA}_0$, $\mathbf{ATR}_0$ is equivalent to the clopen Ramsey theorem.

The case in which B is a barrier follows, because any block contained in a barrier is a barrier. Both statements are studied in great detail in [2]. $\square$

Lemma 2.14. ($\mathbf{ATR}_0$) *Every block contains a barrier.*

Proof. We reason in $\mathbf{ATR}_0$. Let B be a block: define $B_1 = \{s \in B \mid \forall t \in B \ t \not\sqsubset s\}$ and $B_2 = B \setminus B_1$. By theorem 2.13 there exists a block B' such that either $B' \subseteq B_1$ or $B' \subseteq B_2$. In the first case B' is a barrier and thus it suffices to show that $B' \subseteq B_2$ leads to a contradiction.

If $B' \subseteq B_2$ let $s_0 \in B'$ be such that $\text{lh}(s_0) = \min \{\text{lh}(s) \mid s \in B'\}$. Since $s_0 \notin B_1$ there exists $t \in B$ such that $t \sqsubset s_0$. Obviously $\text{lh}(t) < \text{lh}(s_0)$. Since $B' \subseteq B$ is a block we must have $t \in B'$, thereby contradicting the minimality of $\text{lh}(s_0)$. $\square$

Lemma 2.15. ($\mathbf{ATR}_0$) *Let $f : B \rightarrow Q$ be a Q -array. There exists a barrier $B' \subseteq B$ such that $f \upharpoonright B'$ is either bad or perfect.*

Proof. We reason in $\mathbf{ATR}_0$. Let $B^2 = \{s \cup t \mid s, t \in B \wedge s \triangleleft t\}$. It is easy to check that B^2 is a barrier and that for every $t \in B^2$ there are unique $\pi_0(t), \pi_1(t) \in B$ such that $t = \pi_0(t) \cup \pi_1(t)$ and $\pi_0(t) \triangleleft \pi_1(t)$.

Let $B_1 = \{t \in B^2 \mid f(\pi_0(t)) \preceq f(\pi_1(t))\}$ and $B_2 = B^2 \setminus B_1$. By theorem 2.13 there exists a barrier $B'' \subseteq B^2$ such that either $B'' \subseteq B_1$ or $B'' \subseteq B_2$. Let $B' = \{s \in B \mid s \sqsubset \text{base}(B'')\}$: B' is a barrier. If $B'' \subseteq B_1$ then $f \upharpoonright B'$ is perfect, if $B'' \subseteq B_2$ then $f \upharpoonright B'$ is bad. $\square$

To state the locally minimal bad array lemma we need the following definition.

Definition 2.16. ($\mathbf{RCA}_0$) Let $(Q, \preceq)$ be a quasi-ordering. A transitive binary relation $<'$ on Q is compatible with $\preceq$ if for every $q_0, q_1 \in Q$ we have that $q_0 <' q_1$ implies $q_0 \preceq q_1$. We write $q_0 \leq' q_1$ for $q_0 <' q_1 \vee q_0 = q_1$. In this situation if f and g are Q -arrays we write $f \leq' g$ if $\text{dom}(f) \subseteq \text{dom}(g)$ and $\forall s \in \text{dom}(f) \ f(s) \leq' g(s)$. We write $f <' g$ if $f \leq' g$ and $f \neq g \upharpoonright \text{dom}(f)$ (i.e. $\exists s \in \text{dom}(f) \ f(s) <' g(s)$). A Q -array f is locally minimal bad with respect to $<'$ if f is bad (with respect to $\preceq$) and there is no $g <' f$ which is bad (with respect to $\preceq$).

The following theorem is the locally minimal bad array lemma: the proof we give here is similar to Nash-Williams' original proof ([19]) and rather different from the one given in [15] and [16]: it has the advantage of being formalizable within $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ without the use of β -models.

Theorem 2.17. ($\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$) *Let $(Q, \preceq)$ be a quasi-ordering, $<'$ a well-founded relation on Q which is compatible with $\preceq$ and f a bad Q -array: then there exists $g \leq' f$ which is locally minimal bad with respect to $<'$.*

Proof. We reason within $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$. Given f let $B = \text{dom}(f)$ and let T be the tree of the sequences of the form $\langle (s_0, q_0), \dots, (s_{k-1}, q_{k-1}) \rangle$ satisfying the following conditions:

1. $\forall i < k (s_i \in B \wedge q_i \in Q \wedge \forall j < i s_j \neq s_i)$;
2. there exists a bad Q -array g such that $\forall i < k (s_i \in \text{dom}(g) \wedge g(s_i) = q_i)$ and $g \leq' f$.

T exists by Σ_1^1 comprehension (which is equivalent to Π_1^1 comprehension and hence available in $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$): in fact condition (2) in the above definition asserts the existence of a set $X \in [\text{base}(B)]^\omega$ and a map $g : B \cap [X]^{<\omega} \rightarrow Q$ satisfying

$$\forall s, t \in B \cap [X]^{<\omega} (g(s) \leq' f(s) \wedge (s \triangleleft t \longrightarrow f(s) \not\leq f(t)))$$

together with $\forall i < k (s_i \in X \wedge g(s_i) = q_i)$.

We will now define recursively two infinite sequences $\langle s_k \rangle$ and $\langle q_k \rangle$ such that for every k the finite sequence $t_k = \langle (s_i, q_i) : i < k \rangle$ belongs to T . Suppose that $s_0, \dots, s_{k-1}$ and $q_0, \dots, q_{k-1}$ have already been defined and notice that there exists at least one pair $(s, q) \in B \times Q$ such that $t_k \hat{\ } \langle (s, q) \rangle \in T$. Let s_k be such that $\max(s_k)$ is minimal among the $s \in B$ such that for some q we have $t_k \hat{\ } \langle (s, q) \rangle \in T$. Notice that if $i < k$ then $\max(s_i) \leq \max(s_k)$. Now let q_k be minimal with respect to $<'$ among the $q \in Q$ such that $t_k \hat{\ } \langle (s_k, q) \rangle \in T$ (q_k exists because $<'$ is well-founded).

Let $B^* = \{s_k \mid k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and let $g : B^* \rightarrow Q$ be defined by $g(s_k) = q_k$. We claim that B^* is a subbarrier of B and $g \leq' f$ is a locally minimal bad Q -array.

To prove that B^* is a barrier we begin by noticing that $\text{base}(B^*)$ is infinite because the s_k 's are all distinct and that condition (3') in the definition of barrier is obviously satisfied because $B^* \subseteq B$ and B is a barrier. To prove condition (2) in the definition of barrier we will prove that if $s \in B$ is such that $s \subset \text{base}(B^*)$ then $s \in B^*$: since condition (2) holds for B this suffices to show that B^* is a subbarrier. Suppose that for some $s \in B$ such that $s \subset \text{base}(B^*)$ we have $s \notin B^*$: since $\text{base}(B^*) = \bigcup_k s_k$ for some k we have $\max(s_k) > \max(s)$ and $s \subseteq \bigcup_{i < k} s_i$. Let g_k be a Q -array satisfying condition (2) in the definition of T for the sequence t_k : since $\text{dom}(g_k)$ is a subbarrier of B we have that $s \in \text{dom}(g_k)$. But then $t_k \hat{\ } \langle (s, g_k(s)) \rangle \in T$ and this violates the minimality of $\max(s_k)$. This completes the proof that B^* is a barrier.

$g \leq' f$ follows immediately from the definitions of T and g .

To prove that g is bad let $s_k \triangleleft s_h$: then $\max(s_k) < \max(s_h)$ and hence $k < h$. Let g_{h+1} be a Q -array satisfying condition (2) in the definition of T for the sequence t_{h+1} : we have that $s_k, s_h \in \text{dom}(g_{h+1})$ and, since g_{h+1} is bad, $q_k \not\leq q_h$, i.e. $g(s_k) \not\leq g(s_h)$.

To prove that g is locally minimal bad suppose that $g' <' g$ is bad and let $B' = \text{dom}(g') \subseteq B^*$. Let k be minimal such that $g'(s_k) <' q_k$, so that for all $i < k$ such that $s_i \in B'$ we have $g'(s_i) = q_i$. Let B'' be the unique subbarrier of B^* such that $\text{base}(B'') = \text{base}(B') \cup \{n \in \text{base}(B^*) \mid n \leq \max(s_k)\}$ and let $A = \{s \in B'' \mid s \in B' \wedge \max(s) \geq \max(s_k)\}$. Define $g'' : B'' \rightarrow Q$ by

$$g''(s) = \begin{cases} g'(s) & \text{if } s \in A \\ g(s) & \text{if } s \notin A \end{cases}$$

We claim that g'' is bad. To see this suppose $s, t \in B''$ are such that $s \triangleleft t$. There are three different possibilities:

1. If $s \in A$ then also $t \in A$ (because B' is a barrier and $\max(s) < \max(t)$) and $g'(s) \not\leq g'(t)$ implies $g''(s) \not\leq g''(t)$.
2. If $s \notin A$ and $t \notin A$ then $g(s) \not\leq g(t)$ implies $g''(s) \not\leq g''(t)$.

3. If $s \notin A$ and $t \in A$ then $g'(t) \leq' g(t)$ and hence $g'(t) \preceq g(t)$. On the other hand $g(s) \not\leq g(t)$ and hence $g(s) \not\leq g'(t)$, that is $g''(s) \not\leq g''(t)$.

Therefore g'' is bad. If $i \leq k$ we have $s_i \subseteq \{n \in \text{base}(B^*) \mid n \leq \max(s_k)\}$ and hence $s_i \in B''$. Moreover $\forall i < k$ $g''(s_i) = q_i$ and thus $t_k \wedge \langle (s_k, g''(s_k)) \rangle \in T$. Then $g''(s_k) = g'(s_k) <' q_k$ contradicts the minimality of q_k . This completes the proof that g is locally minimal bad. $\square$

In section 6 we will reverse this theorem by showing that the locally minimal bad array lemma implies $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ and hence cannot be proved in any weaker system.

3. TRANSFINITE SEQUENCES

In this section we give the precise statements of the two theorems we will study in the next sections.

Definition 3.1. ($\mathbf{RCA}_0$) Given a set Q we denote by $\tilde{Q}$ the class of all countable transfinite sequences of elements of Q , i.e. functions with domain a countable ordinal and range a subset of Q . $Q^{<\omega}$ consists of all elements of $\tilde{Q}$ whose domain is a finite ordinal: these finite sequences can be viewed as finite sequences of natural numbers and hence $Q^{<\omega}$ is actually a set in $\mathbf{RCA}_0$.

Since the property of being an ordinal is Π_1^1 the class $\tilde{Q}$ is defined by a Π_1^1 formula.

We extend the notations of definition 2.1 also to elements of $\tilde{Q}$ and in particular we write $\text{lh}(\sigma)$ in place of $\text{dom}(\sigma)$ whenever $\sigma \in \tilde{Q}$. Operations such as concatenation of elements of $\tilde{Q}$ require operations such as sum of ordinals, while notions such as $\sigma \sqsubseteq \tau$ are defined modulo comparability of ordinals.

Definition 3.2. ($\mathbf{RCA}_0$) If Q is equipped with a quasi-ordering $\preceq$ and $\sigma, \tau \in \tilde{Q}$ we say that σ is embeddable in τ and write $\sigma \leq \tau$ if there exists a strictly increasing map $f : \text{lh}(\sigma) \rightarrow \text{lh}(\tau)$ such that for every $\alpha < \text{dom}(\sigma)$ we have $\sigma(\alpha) \preceq \tau(f(\alpha))$. f is called an embedding of σ in τ .

Remark 3.3. It is easy to see (even within $\mathbf{RCA}_0$) that if $\preceq$ is a quasi-ordering on Q then $\leq$ is a quasi-ordering on $\tilde{Q}$. In $\mathbf{RCA}_0$ the formula $\sigma \leq \tau$ is Σ_1^1 .

Lemma 3.4. ($\mathbf{ATR}_0$) If $\sigma, \tau \in \tilde{Q}$ the formula $\sigma \leq \tau$ is Δ_1^1 .

Proof. To prove that $\sigma \leq \tau$ is Π_1^1 in $\mathbf{ATR}_0$ we construct a canonical (possibly partial) embedding of σ in τ . Define $f : \text{lh}(\sigma) \rightarrow \text{lh}(\tau)$ by transfinite recursion letting, for each $\alpha < \text{lh}(\sigma)$, $f(\alpha)$ to be the least $\beta < \text{lh}(\tau)$ such that $\beta > f(\gamma)$ for all $\gamma < \alpha$ and $\sigma(\alpha) \preceq \tau(\beta)$ if such a β exists; $f(\alpha)$ is undefined otherwise. Let $\varphi(f, \sigma, \tau)$ be the arithmetical formula asserting that f is built this way: then $\sigma \leq \tau$ is equivalent to $\forall f(\varphi(f, \sigma, \tau) \longrightarrow \text{dom}(f) = \text{lh}(\sigma))$, which is Π_1^1 . $\square$

One of the first results in wqo theory (rediscovered many times, see [11]) is Higman's theorem ([9]): if Q is wqo then $Q^{<\omega}$ is wqo. From the point of view of reverse mathematics it follows from the results in section 4 of [28], that Higman's theorem is provable in $\mathbf{ACA}_0$ (see [3] and [15] for details) and in [3] it is proved that Higman's theorem implies $\mathbf{ACA}_0$. In this paper we will be interested in the following natural generalization of Higman's theorem.

Definition 3.5. (RCA₀) We denote by **GHT** the following statement: “if Q is a countable bqo then $Q^{<\omega}$ is a countable bqo”.

GHT is easily provable by a generalization of the standard argument for Higman’s theorem, using some form of the minimal bad array lemma (we will do this in lemma 4.1).

$\tilde{Q}$ is not a set, so we cannot apply the definition of countable bqo to it. We can however imitate definition 2.10 as follows.

Definition 3.6. (RCA₀) A $\tilde{Q}$ -array is a sequence $\langle f(s) : s \in B \rangle$ of elements of $\tilde{Q}$ indexed by a barrier B ; a $\tilde{Q}$ -array is good if $\exists s, t \in B (s \triangleleft t \wedge f(s) \leq f(t))$. If every $\tilde{Q}$ -array is good we say that $\tilde{Q}$ is bqo.

The next definition states the main object of interest of the paper: Nash-Williams’ theorem.

Definition 3.7. (RCA₀) We denote by **NWT** the following statement: “if Q is a countable bqo then $\tilde{Q}$ is bqo”.

NWT was proved by Nash-Williams in [20] and can be considered the first result of bqo theory. Actually Nash-Williams considered arbitrary transfinite sequences of elements of Q , while in $\tilde{Q}$ we have only sequences of countable length: this is necessary to formalize **NWT** in second order arithmetic, where we cannot discuss uncountable ordinals. Pouzet ([21]) proved that Q bqo is actually equivalent to $\tilde{Q}$ wqo, where $\tilde{Q}$ can be taken either in Nash-Williams’ original meaning or in our countable meaning: this shows that our restriction is not very relevant.

To prove **NWT** we will use the class of hereditarily indecomposable sequences and to define it we need the notion of quasi-monotonic sequence.

Definition 3.8. (RCA₀) An infinite sequence $\langle \sigma_n : n \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$ of elements of $\tilde{Q}$ is quasi-monotonic if $\forall n \exists m > n \sigma_n \leq \sigma_m$. We denote by $\sum_n \sigma_n$ the infinite concatenation of the σ_n ’s, i.e. $\sum_n \sigma_n = \sigma_0 \frown \sigma_1 \frown \dots \frown \sigma_n \frown \dots$.

Lemma 3.9. (ATR₀) Suppose $\sigma, \tau \in \tilde{Q}$ are such that $\sigma = \sum_n \sigma_n$, $\tau = \sum_n \tau_n$, the sequence $\langle \tau_n \rangle$ is quasi-monotonic and $\sigma \not\leq \tau$. Then there exists n_0 such that for all m we have $\sigma_{n_0} \not\leq \sum_{n \leq m} \tau_n$.

Proof. We reason in **ATR₀**. Suppose that for every n_0 there is m such that $\sigma_{n_0} \leq \sum_{n \leq m} \tau_n$: using the quasi-monotonicity of $\langle \tau_n \rangle$ we have that for every n_0 and i there exists m such that $\sigma_{n_0} \leq \sum_{i < n \leq m} \tau_n$. By lemma 3.4 (and using the fact that in **ATR₀** we have Δ_1^1 comprehension by theorem 1.2) we can find the least such m . Using the Σ_1^1 choice scheme (available in **ATR₀** by theorem 1.3) we can find a sequence of embeddings that for every n_0 and i witness $\sigma_{n_0} \leq \sum_{i < n \leq m} \tau_n$. By appropriately connecting some of these embeddings we construct an embedding that shows $\sigma \leq \tau$, a contradiction. $\square$

The class of hereditarily indecomposable sequences is denoted by $\mathcal{H}$ and its intuitive definition is the following: all sequences of length 1 are in $\mathcal{H}$ and if $\langle \sigma_n \rangle_{n < \omega}$ is a quasi-monotonic sequence of elements of $\mathcal{H}$ then $\sum_n \sigma_n$ is also in $\mathcal{H}$. This class is formalized within second order arithmetic by means of well-founded trees which encode the construction of the elements of $\mathcal{H}$ from sequences of length 1 by repeated quasi-monotonic sums. In definition 3.11 we will not explicitly state that the tree is

well-founded because, as noted in remark 3.12, this follows from the other conditions of the definition.

The following definition introduces some notation that is useful for the formalization of $\mathcal{H}$ within $\mathbf{RCA}_0$ and which will be used also in sections 4 and 5.

Definition 3.10. ($\mathbf{RCA}_0$) If $\sigma \in \tilde{Q}$ and $\alpha < \beta \leq \text{lh}(\sigma)$ let

$$[\alpha, \beta) = \{ \gamma < \text{lh}(\sigma) \mid \alpha \leq \gamma < \beta \}$$

$[\alpha, \beta)$ is well-ordered by $\leq$ and hence can be regarded as an ordinal. By $\sigma \upharpoonright [\alpha, \beta)$ we will denote the restriction of σ to this ordinal.

Definition 3.11. ($\mathbf{RCA}_0$) $\sigma \in \tilde{Q}$ is hereditarily indecomposable if there exist a tree T and two sequences $\langle \alpha_t : t \in T \rangle$ and $\langle \beta_t : t \in T \rangle$ such that the following conditions are satisfied:

1. $\forall t \in T \ \alpha_t < \beta_t \leq \text{lh}(\sigma)$.
2. $\alpha_{\langle \rangle} = 0$ and $\beta_{\langle \rangle} = \text{lh}(\sigma)$.
3. If $t \in T$ is not an endnode of T (i.e. $\exists n \ t \frown \langle n \rangle \in T$) then for every n we have $t \frown \langle n \rangle \in T$ and $\beta_{t \frown \langle n \rangle} = \alpha_{t \frown \langle n+1 \rangle}$, $\langle \sigma \upharpoonright [\alpha_{t \frown \langle n \rangle}, \beta_{t \frown \langle n \rangle}) : n \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$ is quasi-monotonic, $\alpha_t = \alpha_{t \frown \langle 0 \rangle}$ and $\beta_t = \sup_n \beta_{t \frown \langle n \rangle}$.
4. If $t \in T$ is an endnode of T then $\beta_t = \alpha_t + 1$.

The class of all hereditarily indecomposable sequences is denoted by $\mathcal{H}$.

Remark 3.12. Notice that if T is the tree in the above definition we can prove within $\mathbf{RCA}_0$, using the fact that $\text{lh}(\sigma)$ is an ordinal, that T is well-founded. Notice also that if $\sigma \in \mathcal{H}$ then in $\mathbf{ATR}_0$ we can prove that $\text{lh}(\sigma)$ is indecomposable. Moreover in $\Sigma_1^1\text{-ACA}_0$ we have that if $\sigma \in \tilde{Q}$ then the formula $\sigma \in \mathcal{H}$ is Σ_1^1 (i.e. $\mathcal{H}$ is Σ_1^1 on Π_1^1).

Hereditarily indecomposable sequences are analogous to the hereditarily additively indecomposable countable linear orderings introduced by Laver ([12]) and used by Rosenstein ([23], section 10.5) in his exposition of the proof of Fraïssé's conjecture. Indeed the proofs of lemmas 4.3 and 4.4 (but not that of lemma 4.2) are just translations of the corresponding proofs given by Rosenstein for linear orderings.

4. $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ PROVES NWT

We will prove theorem 4.5, the main results of the paper, by establishing a chain of implications. Throughout the remainder of the paper Q will denote a set equipped with a quasi-ordering $\preceq$.

Lemma 4.1. $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ proves GHT.

Proof. We reason within $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ and suppose Q is a countable bqo such that $Q^{<\omega}$ is not bqo so that there exists a bad $Q^{<\omega}$ -array. On $Q^{<\omega}$ $\sqsubset$ is well-founded and compatible with $\preceq$. Hence, by theorem 2.17, let $f : B \rightarrow Q^{<\omega}$ be locally minimal bad with respect to $\sqsubset$.

Clearly $\forall s \in B \ f(s) \neq \langle \rangle$ and we can define maps $f' : B \rightarrow Q^{<\omega}$ and $g : B \rightarrow Q$ such that for every $s \in B$ we have $f(s) = f'(s) \frown \langle g(s) \rangle$. Since Q is bqo lemma 2.15 implies that there exists a barrier $B' \subseteq B$ such that $g \upharpoonright B'$ is perfect. The badness of f then requires $f' \upharpoonright B'$ to be bad, contradicting the minimality of f since clearly $f' \upharpoonright B' \sqsubset f$. $\square$

The major difference between our proof and the usual proofs of **NWT** lies in the way we establish the following lemma. Our proof (which is a formalization of the proof appearing in [15] and [16]) avoids the use of any form of the minimal bad array lemma and can be carried out in **ATR**₀: in some sense it is more constructive than the usual ones.

Lemma 4.2. (**ATR**₀) *If $Q^{<\omega}$ is a countable bqo then $\mathcal{H}$ is bqo.*

Proof. We reason within **ATR**₀ and suppose that $\mathcal{H}$ is not bqo: let $f : B \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be a bad $\mathcal{H}$ -array, i.e. a $\tilde{Q}$ -array such that for every $r \in B$ we have $f(r) \in \mathcal{H}$. We can assume that $\text{base}(B) = \mathbb{N}$ because every barrier is isomorphic to a barrier with base $\mathbb{N}$.

According to definition 3.11 for every $r \in B$ there exists a tree and two sequences of ordinals which encode the construction of $f(r)$ from sequences of length 1 by quasi-monotonic sums. By Σ_1^1 choice there exists sets coding a sequence of trees $\langle T_r : r \in B \rangle$ and two sequences of sequences of ordinals $\langle \langle \alpha_t^r : t \in T_r \rangle : r \in B \rangle$ and $\langle \langle \beta_t^r : t \in T_r \rangle : r \in B \rangle$ which encode all this information. Let

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \{ (r, t) \mid r \in B \wedge t \in T_r \} \\ H_0 &= \{ (r, t) \in H \mid t \text{ is not an endnode of } T_r \} \\ K &= \{ (r, t, i) \mid r \in B \wedge t \in T_r \wedge i \geq 1 \wedge \alpha_t^r + i \leq \text{lh}(f(r)) \} \end{aligned}$$

If $r \in B$ and $f(r) = \sigma$ we will view $(r, t) \in H$ as a code for the sequence $\sigma \upharpoonright [\alpha_t^r, \beta_t^r) \in \mathcal{H}$ and $(r, t, i) \in K$ as a code for the sequence $\sigma \upharpoonright [\alpha_t^r, \alpha_t^r + i) \in Q^{<\omega}$. With this coding and using Δ_1^1 comprehension we can define a quasi-ordering $\leq^*$ on $H \cup K$ that corresponds to $\leq$ on the sequences coded by the elements of $H \cup K$. Notice that if $(r, t) \in H \setminus H_0$ then (r, t) and $(r, t, 1) \in K$ code the same sequence and hence are equivalent with respect to $\leq^*$. We further extend our identification and if $(r, t) \in H_0$ we write $(r, t) = \sum_n (r, t \frown \langle n \rangle)$: obviously this sum is quasi-monotonic with respect to $\leq^*$.

We will define by arithmetic recursion a sequence of functions $f_k : B_k \rightarrow H_0 \cup K$. We will then prove by induction that B_k is a block with $\text{base}(B_k) = \mathbb{N}$ and f_k is bad (the definition of bad makes sense also if B_k is a block instead of a barrier) with respect to $\leq^*$.

We start with $B_0 = B$ and for every $r \in B$ we define $f_0(r) = (r, \langle \rangle, 1) \in K$ if $(r, \langle \rangle) \in H \setminus H_0$, $f_0(r) = (r, \langle \rangle) \in H_0$ otherwise. Recall the definitions of B^2 , $\pi_0(s)$ and $\pi_1(s)$ from the proof of lemma 2.15 and suppose we have defined f_k and B_k : let

$$C_k = \{ s \in B_k \mid f_k(s) \in K \} \quad \text{and} \quad D_k = \{ s \in B_k^2 \mid f_k(\pi_0(s)) \in H_0 \}.$$

Set $B_{k+1} = C_k \cup D_k$.

Define $f_{k+1} : B_{k+1} \rightarrow H_0 \cup K$ by cases as follows:

1. if $s \in C_k$ let $f_{k+1}(s) = f_k(s)$.
2. if $s \in D_k$, $f_k(\pi_1(s)) \in H_0$ and $(r, t) = f_k(\pi_0(s)) \not\leq^* f_k(\pi_1(s)) = (r', t')$ we have $f_k(\pi_0(s)) = \sum_n (r, t \frown \langle n \rangle)$ and $f_k(\pi_1(s)) = \sum_n (r', t' \frown \langle n \rangle)$ with both sums quasi-monotonic. By lemma 3.9 (and the definition of $\leq^*$) there exists n_0 minimal such that for every m we have $(r, t \frown \langle n_0 \rangle) \not\leq^* \sum_{n \leq m} (r', t' \frown \langle n \rangle)$. If $t \frown \langle n_0 \rangle$ is not an endnode of T_r let $f_{k+1}(s) = (r, t \frown \langle n_0 \rangle) \in H_0$, otherwise let $f_{k+1}(s) = (r, t \frown \langle n_0 \rangle, 1) \in K$ (which, as noted above, is equivalent with respect to $\leq^*$ to $(r, t \frown \langle n_0 \rangle) \in H \setminus H_0$).

3. if $s \in D_k$, $f_k(\pi_1(s)) \in H_0$ and $f_k(\pi_0(s)) \leq^* f_k(\pi_1(s))$ we let $f_{k+1}(s) = f_k(\pi_0(s))$. It will follow from the badness of f_k that this case never occurs.
4. if $s \in D_k$, $f_k(\pi_0(s)) = (r, t)$ and $f_k(\pi_1(s)) = (r', t', i) \in K$ let $f_{k+1}(s) = (r, t, i + 1) \in K$ (notice that since $(r, t) \in H_0$ we have $\alpha_t^r + \omega \leq \text{lh}(f(r))$).

This completes the definitions of B_k and f_k . We shall now prove by induction that they have the desired properties.

It is easy to check inductively that $\text{base}(B_k) = \mathbb{N}$ and that the elements of B_k are incomparable under $\sqsubset$. Since in $\mathbf{ATR}_0$ we do not have Π_1^1 induction we cannot prove inductively that for all k B_k satisfies condition (2) of definition 2.5. This difficulty however can be overcome as follows: we fix $X \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$ and prove by arithmetical induction on k that $\forall m \exists s \in B_k s \sqsubset X^{-m}$, where X^{-m} denotes the result of iterating $X \mapsto X^-$ m times (i.e. $X^{-m} = \langle X(m), X(m+1), \dots \rangle$). Supposing this holds for B_k , let $s \in B_k$ be such that $s \sqsubset X^{-m}$: if $f_k(s) \in K$ then $s \in C_k \subseteq B_{k+1}$; if $f_k(s) \in H_0$ let $t \in B_k$ be such that $t \sqsubset X^{-(m+1)}$, so that $s \triangleleft t$, $s \cup t \in D_k \subseteq B_{k+1}$ and $s \cup t \sqsubset X^{-m}$.

We now assume that f_k is bad (and hence case (3) never occurs in the definition of f_{k+1}) and prove that f_{k+1} is bad. Let $s, s' \in B_{k+1}$ be such that $s \triangleleft s'$. We need to distinguish four different cases:

- (a) if $s, s' \in C_k$ then $f_{k+1}(s) = f_k(s) \not\leq^* f_k(s') = f_{k+1}(s')$.
- (b) if $s \in C_k$ and $s' \in D_k$ then $s \triangleleft \pi_0(s')$ and hence $f_k(s) \not\leq^* f_k(\pi_0(s'))$. Moreover it is clear that $f_{k+1}(s') \leq^* f_k(\pi_0(s'))$ and therefore $f_{k+1}(s) = f_k(s) \not\leq^* f_{k+1}(s')$.
- (c) if $s \in D_k$ and $s' \in C_k$ we have $\pi_1(s) = s'$ and hence in defining $f_{k+1}(s)$ we apply case (4). Therefore the length of the sequence coded by $f_{k+1}(s)$ is strictly greater than the length of the sequence coded by $f_k(s') = f_{k+1}(s')$ and we necessarily have $f_{k+1}(s) \not\leq^* f_{k+1}(s')$.
- (d) if $s, s' \in D_k$ we have $\pi_1(s) = \pi_0(s')$ and hence $f_{k+1}(s)$ is defined applying case (2). Therefore if $f_k(\pi_0(s')) = (r, t)$ for every m we have that $f_{k+1}(s) \not\leq^* \sum_{n \leq m} (r, t \frown \langle n \rangle)$. On the other hand, since $f_{k+1}(s')$ is defined using either case (2) or case (4), for some m $f_{k+1}(s') \leq^* \sum_{n \leq m} (r, t \frown \langle n \rangle)$. These two facts imply $f_{k+1}(s) \not\leq^* f_{k+1}(s')$.

Notice that if $X \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$ and for every k we define $s_k(X)$ to be the unique sequence such that $s_k(X) \in B_k$ and $s_k(X) \sqsubset X$, we have either $s_k(X) \in C_k$ or that the length of the sequence coded by $f_{k+1}(s_{k+1}(X))$ is strictly smaller than the length of the sequence coded by $f_k(s_k(X))$.

Now let us define $B = \bigcup_k C_k$. We claim that B is a block. To see this notice that, by the above observation, for any $X \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$ there exists k such that $s_k(X) \in C_k$: this implies that $\text{base}(B) = \mathbb{N}$ and that condition (2) in definition 2.5 is satisfied. Condition (3) follows from the fact that if $s_k(X) \in C_k$ then for all $k' > k$ we have $s_{k'}(X) = s_k(X)$.

Define $f_\omega : B \rightarrow K$ by setting $f_\omega(s) = f_k(s)$ for the least (or any) k such that $s \in C_k$. It is immediate to check that f_ω is bad and hence if $B' \subseteq B$ is the barrier given by lemma 2.14 $f_\omega \upharpoonright B'$ is also bad. Since f_ω clearly codes a bad $Q^{<\omega}$ -array we have that $Q^{<\omega}$ is not a countable bqo and the proof is complete. $\square$

The following result will be improved by lemma 5.4, but in the present section it suffices to prove theorem 4.5.

Lemma 4.3. ($\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$) *If $\mathcal{H}$ is wqo then every element of $\tilde{Q}$ can be written as the concatenation of finitely many elements of $\mathcal{H}$.*

Proof. Let $\sigma \in \tilde{Q}$ be given: we prove by transfinite induction on $[\alpha, \beta)$ that the lemma holds for $\sigma \upharpoonright [\alpha, \beta)$. For $\alpha = 0$, $\beta = \text{lh}(\sigma)$ this establishes the lemma for σ . For $\sigma \upharpoonright [\alpha, \beta)$ the lemma states

$$\exists \langle \alpha_i : i \leq n \rangle (\alpha_0 = \alpha \wedge \alpha_n = \beta \wedge \forall i < n (\alpha_i < \alpha_{i+1} \wedge \sigma \upharpoonright [\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1}) \in \mathcal{H}))$$

which by remark 3.12 is Σ_1^1 . Hence this induction can be carried out in $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$.

By theorem 1.4 Cantor's normal form theorem is provable in ATR_0 and hence in $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$. Thus it suffices to prove the statement for α, β such that $[\alpha, \beta)$ is indecomposable.

We reason within $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ and begin by noticing that the result is obvious when $\beta = \alpha + 1$. Given $[\alpha, \beta)$ indecomposable and greater than 1 we can write $[\alpha, \beta) = \bigcup_n [\alpha_n, \beta_n)$ so that $\sigma \upharpoonright [\alpha, \beta) = \sum_n \sigma \upharpoonright [\alpha_n, \beta_n)$. Let us write σ_n in place of $\sigma \upharpoonright [\alpha_n, \beta_n)$. By induction hypothesis every σ_n can be written as the concatenation of finitely many elements of $\mathcal{H}$ and hence we can assume that for every n we have $\sigma_n \in \mathcal{H}$.

We claim that there exists m such that $\forall n > m \exists n' > n \sigma_n \leq \sigma_{n'}$. Indeed if this is not the case we have $\forall m \exists n > m \forall n' > n \sigma_n \not\leq \sigma_{n'}$. Then we can find a set $A \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that $n, n' \in A$ and $n < n'$ imply $\sigma_n \not\leq \sigma_{n'}$, against the fact that $\mathcal{H}$ is wqo.

The claim we just proved shows that for some m the sequence $\langle \sigma_n : n > m \rangle$ is quasi-monotonic and hence $\sum_{n > m} \sigma_n \in \mathcal{H}$. Therefore $\sigma_0 \frown \dots \frown \sigma_m \frown (\sum_{n > m} \sigma_n)$ expresses $\sigma \upharpoonright [\alpha, \beta)$ as the concatenation of finitely many elements of $\mathcal{H}$. $\square$

Lemma 4.4. ($\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$) *If $\mathcal{H}$ is bqo then $\tilde{Q}$ is bqo.*

Proof. We reason within $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$. If $f : B \rightarrow \tilde{Q}$ is a $\tilde{Q}$ -array for every $s \in B$ we can write, by lemma 4.3, $f(s) = \tau_{s,0} \frown \dots \frown \tau_{s,k_s}$ where $\tau_{s,i} \in \mathcal{H}$. Since $\mathcal{H}$ is bqo the set $R = \{(s, i) \mid s \in B \wedge i \leq k_s\}$ with the quasi-ordering defined by setting $(s, i) \preceq_R (t, j)$ if and only if $\tau_{s,i} \leq \tau_{t,j}$ is a countable bqo. We can apply lemma 4.1 and $R^{<\omega}$ is also a countable bqo: hence there exist $s \triangleleft t$ in B such that $\langle (s, 0), \dots, (s, k_s) \rangle \leq \langle (t, 0), \dots, (t, k_t) \rangle$ in $R^{<\omega}$ and therefore $f(s) \leq f(t)$. $\square$

Theorem 4.5. $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ *proves NWT.*

Proof. It suffices to concatenate lemmas 4.1, 4.2 and 4.4. $\square$

5. NWT IN ATR_0

The following theorem, due to Shore, sheds further light on the logical strength of NWT.

Theorem 5.1. (RCA_0) *The statement “the class of countable well-orderings is wqo under embeddability” implies ATR_0 .*

Proof. See [24]. $\square$

Corollary 5.2. RCA_0 *proves that NWT implies ATR_0 .*

Proof. Let Q be a quasi-ordering consisting of a single element: Q is a countable bqo (with respect to the identity relation) and by **NWT** $\tilde{Q}$ is also bqo and hence wqo. Moreover in this case $\tilde{Q}$ is isomorphic to the class of countable well-orderings ordered by embeddability. Thus the statement contained in theorem 5.1 is a consequence of **NWT** in **RCA**₀ and **NWT** implies **ATR**₀. $\square$

Thus theorem 4.5 and corollary 5.2 establish $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ and **ATR**₀ as upper and lower bounds for the logical strength of **NWT**. In this section we show that **NWT** is not equivalent to $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ and discuss the possibility of proving the following conjecture, which would improve the result of section 4.

Conjecture 5.3. **ATR**₀ *proves* **NWT**.

In light of corollary 5.2, proving conjecture 5.3 would imply that the answer to the question “which set existence axioms are needed to prove **NWT**?” is Arithmetical Transfinite Recursion. Answers of this kind are typical reverse mathematics results.

The following lemma improves lemma 4.3 and is a step towards proving conjecture 5.3. The proof consists of carrying out some parts of the argument used to prove lemma 4.3 inside an ω -model.

Lemma 5.4. (**ATR**₀) *If $\mathcal{H}$ is wqo then every element of $\tilde{Q}$ can be written as the concatenation of finitely many elements of $\mathcal{H}$.*

Proof. We reason within **ATR**₀ and let $\sigma \in \tilde{Q}$: using Σ_1^1 choice we can construct a single set X which codes σ , a witness for the Cantor’s normal form for every ordinal $[\alpha, \beta]$ with $\alpha < \beta \leq \text{lh}(\sigma)$ and the canonical witness of the proof of lemma 3.4 for $\sigma \upharpoonright [\alpha, \beta] \leq \sigma \upharpoonright [\alpha', \beta']$ (i.e. the unique f such that $\varphi(f, \sigma \upharpoonright [\alpha, \beta], \sigma \upharpoonright [\alpha', \beta'])$ holds) for every two such pairs α, β and α', β' .

By theorem 1.8 there exists a countable ω -model $\mathfrak{M}$ of $\Sigma_1^1\text{-AC}_0$ such that $X \in \mathfrak{M}$. By our construction the formulas $\sigma \upharpoonright [\alpha, \beta] \leq \sigma \upharpoonright [\alpha', \beta']$ are Δ_1^1 within $\mathfrak{M}$.

By transfinite induction on the length of $[\alpha, \beta]$ we prove that

$$\forall \alpha, \beta < \text{lh}(\sigma) (\alpha < \beta \longrightarrow$$

$$\mathfrak{M} \models (\sigma \upharpoonright [\alpha, \beta] \text{ is the concatenation of finitely many elements of } \mathcal{H}))$$

This transfinite induction can be carried out in **ATR**₀ because $\mathfrak{M} \models \psi$ is an arithmetical formula even when ψ is not arithmetical. Moreover this induction will complete the proof of the lemma because for $\alpha = 0, \beta = \text{lh}(\sigma)$ we obtain that σ satisfies the lemma within $\mathfrak{M}$ and, since the statement of the lemma is Σ_1^1 (as already noticed in the proof of lemma 4.3), it satisfies the lemma also in general.

Since we have enough instances of Cantor’s normal form theorem within $\mathfrak{M}$, it suffices to consider the case where $[\alpha, \beta]$ is indecomposable. If $[\alpha, \beta]$ has length 1 the statement is trivial. Otherwise we reason in $\mathfrak{M}$ and write $\sigma \upharpoonright [\alpha, \beta] = \sum_n \sigma_n$ as in the proof of lemma 4.3: by induction hypothesis we may assume that for every n $\sigma_n \in \mathcal{H}$.

Now we claim that $\exists m \forall n > m \exists n' > n \sigma_n \leq \sigma_{n'}$. If this is not the case we have

$$\mathfrak{M} \models (\forall m \exists n > m \forall n' > n \sigma_n \not\leq \sigma_{n'})$$

Since the formula under consideration is Δ_1^1 (to establish this we need to use $\Sigma_1^1\text{-AC}_0$ so that the numerical quantifiers can be brought inside the set quantifier of $\not\leq$) it is absolute and holds also outside $\mathfrak{M}$ and, as in the proof of lemma 4.3, we reach a contradiction with the hypothesis that $\mathcal{H}$ is wqo.

From the claim we complete the induction step exactly as we did in the proof of lemma 4.3 and the proof is complete. $\square$

Theorem 5.5. *$\mathbf{ATR}_0$ proves that $\mathbf{GHT}$ and $\mathbf{NWT}$ are equivalent.*

Proof. Since $Q^{<\omega}$ is a subset of $\tilde{Q}$ it is obvious that $\mathbf{NWT}$ implies $\mathbf{GHT}$ even in $\mathbf{RCA}_0$.

We now reason within $\mathbf{ATR}_0$. Assuming $\mathbf{GHT}$ and using lemma 4.2 we have that if Q is a countable bqo then $\mathcal{H}$ is bqo. Repeating the proof of lemma 4.4, from $\mathbf{GHT}$ and lemma 5.4 it follows that $\mathcal{H}$ bqo implies $\tilde{Q}$ bqo.

Therefore using $\mathbf{GHT}$ we can prove in $\mathbf{ATR}_0$ that if Q is a countable bqo then $\tilde{Q}$ is bqo, i.e. $\mathbf{NWT}$. $\square$

Hence we have reduced conjecture 5.3 to the following conjecture.

Conjecture 5.6. *$\mathbf{ATR}_0$ proves $\mathbf{GHT}$.*

Since $Q^{<\omega}$ is a “small” subset of $\tilde{Q}$ this is a significant step towards establishing conjecture 5.3.

Note that in the proof of lemma 15 in [3] Clote claims that $\mathbf{GHT}$ is provable even in $\mathbf{ACA}_0$ by modifying the techniques used in [28] to show that Higman’s theorem is provable in $\mathbf{ACA}_0$. We have not been able to find such a modification.

A natural way of refuting our conjectures would be to prove that $\mathbf{NWT}$ (or, equivalently, $\mathbf{GHT}$) implies $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ over $\mathbf{ATR}_0$. The following theorem shows that this is not possible.

Theorem 5.7. *$\mathbf{ATR}_0$ does not prove that $\mathbf{NWT}$ implies $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$.*

Proof. Assume $\mathbf{ATR}_0$ proves that $\mathbf{NWT}$ implies $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$. By theorem 5.5 $\mathbf{ATR}_0$ proves that $\mathbf{GHT}$ implies $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$. $\mathbf{GHT}$ is a Π_3^1 statement and hence we cannot apply corollary 1.10 directly; however, going back to the proof of lemma 4.1 we can observe that a statement ψ slightly stronger than $\mathbf{GHT}$ was obtained in $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ (and hence is consistent with $\mathbf{ATR}_0$). ψ states: “if B is a barrier and Q is B -wqo then $Q^{<\omega}$ is B -wqo” where B -wqo means that every array with domain a subbarrier of B (including B itself) is good (this notion is strictly connected with that of α -wqo studied in [21], [3], [15] and [16]). $\mathbf{RCA}_0$ proves that B -wqo for every barrier B is equivalent to bqo and hence that ψ implies $\mathbf{GHT}$. Moreover ψ is Π_2^1 and the fact that $\mathbf{ATR}_0$ proves that it implies $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ contradicts corollary 1.10. $\square$

6. THE LOCALLY MINIMAL BAD ARRAY LEMMA IMPLIES $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$

In this section we obtain a typical reverse mathematics result by showing that the locally minimal bad array lemma (i.e. the statement proved within $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ in theorem 2.17) is equivalent to $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ over $\mathbf{RCA}_0$. We actually prove that the special case obtained by assuming that the barriers we deal with consist exclusively of singletons (an array with domain such a barrier is called a bad sequence because of the identification made in remark 2.11) implies $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$. This special case is known as the minimal bad sequence lemma and is a basic tool of wqo theory. Let us state it more explicitly.

Definition 6.1. ($\mathbf{RCA}_0$) We say that a Q -sequence $\langle q_n : n \in A \rangle$ with $A \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$ is bad if $\forall n, m \in A (n < m \rightarrow q_n \not\leq q_m)$. If $<'$ is compatible with $\leq$ and $\langle q_n : n \in A \rangle$ and $\langle q'_n : n \in A' \rangle$ are two Q -sequences we write $\langle q_n \rangle \leq' \langle q'_n \rangle$ if $A \subseteq A'$

and $\forall n \in A \ q_n \leq' q'_n$; we write $\langle q_n \rangle <' \langle q'_n \rangle$ if $\langle q_n \rangle \leq' \langle q'_n \rangle$ and $\exists n \in A \ q_n <' q'_n$. $\langle q_n \rangle$ is minimal bad with respect to $<'$ if it is bad and there is no $\langle q'_n \rangle <' \langle q_n \rangle$ which is bad.

Definition 6.2. The minimal bad sequence lemma is the following statement: *let $(Q, \preceq)$ be a quasi-ordering and $<'$ a well-founded relation on Q which is compatible with $\preceq$: if there exists a bad Q -sequence then there exists a Q -sequence which is minimal bad with respect to $<'$.*

We start our proof that the minimal bad sequence lemma implies $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ by deducing ACA_0 .

Lemma 6.3. (RCA_0) *The minimal bad sequence lemma implies ACA_0 .*

Proof. It is well-known that ACA_0 is equivalent to Σ_1^0 comprehension over RCA_0 . Let $\psi(n, m)$ be a Δ_0^0 formula. Reasoning in RCA_0 we want to show that there exists a set Z such that $\forall n (n \in Z \iff \exists m \psi(n, m))$. Let Q be the set of all finite sequences of natural numbers and define

$$s \preceq t \iff \text{lh}(s) = \text{lh}(t) \wedge \forall n < \text{lh}(s) (\psi(n, t(n)) \longrightarrow \psi(n, s(n)))$$

Let $s <' t$ if and only if $s \preceq t$ and $t \not\preceq s$.

$<'$ is well-founded on Q and there exists a bad Q -sequence with respect to $\preceq$: we are therefore in the hypothesis of the minimal bad sequence lemma. Let $\langle s_k : k \in A \rangle$ be a minimal bad Q -sequence. Let $n_k = \text{lh}(s_k)$ for every k : since $\langle s_k \rangle$ is bad it is immediate that for every n there exists only finitely many $k \in A$ such that $n_k = n$. We claim that

$$\forall n (\exists m \psi(n, m) \iff \forall k \in A (n_k > n \longrightarrow \psi(n, s_k(n))))$$

One direction follows from the above observation. For the other direction suppose $\psi(n, m)$ holds but i is such that $n_i > n$ and $\psi(n, s_i(n))$ does not hold. Let t_i be such that $\text{lh}(t_i) = n_i$, $t_i(n) = m$ and $t_i(j) = s_i(j)$ if $j \neq n$. Then $t_i <' s_i$. Let $t_k = s_k$ if $k \neq i$ and $A' = \{k \in A \mid k = i \vee n_k \neq n_i\}$. $\langle t_k : k \in A' \rangle$ is bad and $\langle t_k : k \in A' \rangle <' \langle s_k : k \in A \rangle$, contradicting the minimality of $\langle s_k \rangle$.

The set Z can now be defined by Δ_1^0 comprehension, which is available in RCA_0 . $\square$

The following definition is helpful in the proof of the main result of this section.

Definition 6.4. (RCA_0) If T is a tree and $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is a path through T (i.e. for every n we have $f[n] \in T$) we say that f is the leftmost path through T if for every path $g \neq f$ through T there exists n such that $f[n] = g[n]$ and $f(n) < g(n)$.

Theorem 6.5. (RCA_0) *The following are equivalent:*

1. $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$;
2. *The locally minimal bad array lemma;*
3. *The minimal bad sequence lemma;*
4. *If T is a non well-founded tree then there exists the leftmost path through T .*

Proof. (1) implies (2) is theorem 2.17 and (3) is a special case of (2): hence it suffices to prove that (3) implies (4) and that (4) implies (1).

Assume the minimal bad sequence lemma: by lemma 6.3 we can reason in ACA_0 . Let T be a non well-founded tree. Let $Q = T$ and define $\preceq$ to be the Kleene-Brouwer

order $\leq_{KB}$. Recall that $s \leq_{KB} t$ if and only if either $t \sqsubseteq s$ or for some $i < \text{lh}(s), \text{lh}(t)$ we have $s[i] = t[i]$ and $s(i) < t(i)$. $\leq_{KB}$ is a linear order and, since T is not well-founded, is not a well-ordering on T (this can easily be proved in $\mathbf{RCA}_0$) and therefore is not a wqo. Define $<'$ by $s <' t$ if and only if $s <_{KB} t \wedge \text{lh}(s) \leq \text{lh}(t)$. $<'$ is well-founded on T because for every $t \in T$ the set $\{s \mid s <' t\}$ is a well-founded tree and hence $\leq_{KB}$, and therefore also $<'$, is well-founded on it (here reasoning in $\mathbf{RCA}_0$ would not suffice).

Thus we are in the hypothesis of the minimal bad sequence lemma and there exists a minimal bad T -sequence $\langle s_n \rangle$ with respect to $<'$. Notice that $\langle s_n \rangle$ is actually a descending chain with respect to $\leq_{KB}$. For notational simplicity we assume that s_n is defined for every n . We claim that for every n $s_n \sqsubset s_{n+1}$. Suppose this is not the case and $s_m \not\sqsubset s_{m+1}$: since $s_{m+1} <_{KB} s_m$ there exists $i < \text{lh}(s_m), \text{lh}(s_{m+1})$ such that $s_m[i] = s_{m+1}[i]$ and $s_m(i) > s_{m+1}(i)$. Let $t_m = s_{m+1}[i+1]$, so that $t_m <' s_m$ and $s_{m+1} \leq_{KB} t_m$. Moreover let $t_n = s_n$ if $n \neq m$ and $A = \{m\} \cup \{n \mid n > m+1\}$. Then $\langle t_n : n \in A \rangle$ is bad and $\langle t_n : n \in A \rangle <' \langle s_n : n \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$, a contradiction which establishes the claim.

The claim implies that there exists $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that for every n $s_n \sqsubset f$. It is easy to check that f is the leftmost path through T .

To show that (4) implies (1) recall that $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ is equivalent (over $\mathbf{RCA}_0$) to the following statement: if $\langle T_n \rangle$ is a sequence of trees there exists a set Z such that $\forall n (n \in Z \iff T_n \text{ is well-founded})$. Let $\langle T_n \rangle$ be given. For every n let $T'_n = \{ \langle 0 \rangle \frown s \mid s \in T_n \} \cup \{ s \mid \forall i < \text{lh}(s) \ s(i) = 1 \}$. Clearly T'_n is not well-founded. Let T be the tree obtained by interleaving the T'_n 's, i.e.

$$T = \{ t \mid \forall (i, n) < \text{lh}(t) \ \langle t((0, n)), \dots, t((i, n)) \rangle \in T'_n \}$$

T is not well-founded and hence by (4) it has a leftmost path f . Let $Z = \{ n \mid f((0, n)) = 1 \}$. It is easy to check that Z has the desired property. $\square$

The binary relation used in proving **GHT** in lemma 4.1 has the property that for every $q \in Q$ the set $\{q' \in Q \mid q' <' q\}$ is finite. We do not know whether the minimal bad sequence lemma restricted to $<'$ having this additional property implies $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$.

We would like to mention also that a more general version of the locally minimal bad array lemma is provable in $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$. This version asserts that the lemma holds also if Q is an (uncountable) analytic set, $\preceq$ is coanalytic and $<'$ is analytic: the proof consists of carrying out part of the proof of theorem 2.17 inside a β -model.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. AHARONI, M. MAGIDOR AND R. A. SHORE, *On the strength of König's duality theorem for infinite bipartite graphs*, J. Combin. Theory, ser. B **54** (1992), 257–290.
- [2] P. CLOTE, *A recursion theoretic analysis of the clopen Ramsey theorem*, J. Symbolic Logic **49** (1984), 376–400.
- [3] P. CLOTE, *The metamathematics of Fraïssé's order type conjecture*, in *Recursion Theory Week*, edited by K. Ambos-Spies, G. H. Müller and G. E. Sacks, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1432**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1990, pp. 41–56.
- [4] F. VAN ENGELEN, A. W. MILLER AND J. STEEL, *Rigid Borel sets and better quasiorder theory*, in [14], pp. 199–222.
- [5] H. FRIEDMAN AND J. L. HIRST, *Weak comparability of well orderings and reverse mathematics*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **47** (1990), 11–29.
- [6] H. FRIEDMAN, J. MCALOON AND S. G. SIMPSON, *A finite combinatorial principle which is equivalent to the 1-consistency of predicative analysis*, in *Patras Logic Symposium*, edited by G. Metakides, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1986, pp. 197–230.

- [7] H. FRIEDMAN, N. ROBERTSON AND P. SEYMOUR, *The metamathematics of the graph minor theorem*, in [14], pp. 229–261.
- [8] *Graphs and Orders*, edited by I. Rival, D. Reidel, Boston, 1985.
- [9] G. HIGMAN, *Ordering by divisibility in abstract algebras*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **2** (1952), 326–336.
- [10] J. L. HIRST, *Reverse mathematics and ordinal exponentiation*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **66** (1994), 1–18.
- [11] J. B. KRUSKAL, *The theory of well-quasi-ordering: a frequently discovered concept*, J. Combin. Theory, ser. A **13** (1972), 297–305.
- [12] R. LAVER, *On Fraïssé’s order type conjecture*, Ann. of Math. **93** (1971), 89–111.
- [13] R. LAVER, *Better-quasi-orderings and a class of trees*, in *Studies in Foundations and Combinatorics*, Adv. in Math. Supplementary Series **1**, Academic Press, New York, 1978, pp. 31–48.
- [14] *Logic and Combinatorics*, edited by S. G. Simpson, Contemporary Mathematics **65**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1987.
- [15] A. MARCONE, *Foundations of bqo theory and subsystems of second order arithmetic*, Ph.d. thesis, The Pennsylvania State University, 1993.
- [16] A. MARCONE, *Foundations of bqo theory*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., to appear.
- [17] E. C. MILNER, *Basic wqo- and bqo-theory*, in [8], pp. 487–502.
- [18] C. ST. J. A. NASH-WILLIAMS, *On well-quasi-ordering transfinite sequences*, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **61** (1965), 33–39.
- [19] C. ST. J. A. NASH-WILLIAMS, *On well-quasi-ordering infinite trees*, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **61** (1965), 697–720.
- [20] C. ST. J. A. NASH-WILLIAMS, *On better-quasi-ordering transfinite sequences*, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **64** (1968), 273–290.
- [21] M. POUZET, *Sur les prémeilleurordres*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **22** (1972), 1–20.
- [22] M. POUZET, *Applications of well quasi-ordering and better quasi-ordering*, in [8], pp. 503–519.
- [23] J. G. ROSENSTEIN, *Linear Orderings*, Academic Press, New York, 1982.
- [24] R. A. SHORE, *On the strength of Fraïssé’s conjecture*, in *Logical Methods*, edited by J. N. Crossley, J. B. Remmel, R. A. Shore and M. E. Sweedler, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1993, pp. 782–813.
- [25] S. G. SIMPSON, *Bqo-theory and Fraïssé’s conjecture*, chapter 9 of: R. Mansfield and G. Weitzkamp, *Recursive Aspects of Descriptive Set Theory*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1985.
- [26] S. G. SIMPSON, *Nonprovability of certain combinatorial properties of finite trees*, in *Harvey Friedman’s Research on the Foundations of Mathematics*, edited by L. A. Harrington, M. D. Morley, A. Šcedrov and S. G. Simpson, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1985, pp. 87–117.
- [27] S. G. SIMPSON, *Subsystems of Z_2 and reverse mathematics*, appendix to G. Takeuti, *Proof Theory*, 2nd edition, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1986.
- [28] S. G. SIMPSON, *Ordinal numbers and the Hilbert basis theorem*, J. Symbolic Logic **53** (1988), 961–974.
- [29] S. G. SIMPSON, *On the strength of König’s duality theorem for countable bipartite graphs*, J. Symbolic Logic **59** (1994), 113–123.
- [30] S. G. SIMPSON, *Subsystems of Second Order Arithmetic*, in preparation.

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, UNIVERSITÀ DI TORINO, VIA CARLO ALBERTO 10, 10123 TORINO, ITALY
E-mail address: marcone@dm.unito.it